

WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:

1. An integrated electronic process for reviewing a development project to evaluate for potential defects in a product under development, comprising:

5 creating an evaluation review header identifying a peer review moderator, author and task leader;

creating a peer review team identifying the review team members and the roles of the author and the moderator;

10 identifying potential defects within the roles of the author, moderator and the review team members and generating a database record of potential defects;

review the database record of potential defects by the author, moderator and review team members to evaluate  
15 identified potential defects for acceptance or rejection;

remove the accepted potential defects from the database record of the potential defects;

enter the accepted potential defects into an action request database; and

20 confirm that accepted potential defects have been removed from the record of potential defects by completion of a rework action.

2. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 1  
25 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect type.

10081710.022002

3. The integrated electronic process as in Claim 2 wherein selecting a defect type comprises one or more of the following:

5 selecting an omission indicating a required item was not included;

selecting an inclusion indicating the inclusion of an item not required;

selecting compliance indicating an artifact does not meet established standards;

10 selecting testability indicating a function or capability either cannot be tested or violates specific testing guidelines; and

selecting efficiency indicating production of the correct results.

15

4. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 1 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect reason.

064751.0329

5. The integrated electronic process as in Claim 4 wherein selecting a defect reason comprises one or more of the following:

selecting scope indicating a customer change  
5 resulted in a defect;

selecting unaware indicating the lack of awareness of pertinent and available information or making of an incorrect assumption;

selecting mistake indicating a defect by mistake;  
10 selecting misapplied process indicating an incorrectly executed process step;

selecting incorrect process indicating a defect caused by an incorrect process step;

selecting unclear process indicating a defect caused  
15 by not clearly defined information;

selecting no process indicating a defect caused by ad hoc procedures for a situation not covered by a documented process; and

selecting reuse indicating an inherent item defect  
20 previously assumed to be defect-free.

6. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 1 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect category.

7. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 6 wherein selecting a defect category comprises one or more of the following:

- 5       selecting not properly handling previous data indicating improper initialization of a variable;
- selecting legacy or debug code caused an error;
- selecting wrong data value or data field used indicating an incorrect data value or use of an incorrect data field;
- 10       selecting timing errors;
- selecting conversion or calculation errors;
- selecting functions enabled/disabled incorrectly;
- selecting some action was or was not taken when an event occurred;
- 15       selecting incorrect data file or table error;
- selecting interface errors;
- selecting inadequate range/error checking;
- selecting configuration control error;
- selecting an error introduced while fixing another
- 20   error;
- selecting performance deficiency; and
- selecting pointer/indexing error.

10081710-022000

8. An integrated electronic process for reviewing a development project to evaluate for potential defects in a product under development, comprising:

identifying potential defects within the roles of an author, moderator and review team members and generating a record of potential defects;

reviewing the potential defects by the author, moderator and review team members to evaluate identified potential defects for acceptance or rejection;

remove the accepted potential defects from the record of the potential defects;

enter the accepted potential defects into an action request database; and

tracking the rework of accepted defects until the rework of an accepted defect has been completed.

9. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 8 further comprising monitoring the rework of an accepted defect for removal from the action request database.

10. The integrated electronic process as in Claim 9 further comprising confirming that accepted potential defects have been removed from the record of potential defects by completion of a rework action.

11. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 8 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect type.

20081210-022002

12. The integrated electronic process as in Claim 11 wherein selecting a defect type comprises one or more of the following:

5 selecting an omission indicating a required item was not included;

selecting an inclusion indicating the inclusion of an item not required;

selecting compliance indicating an artifact does not meet established standards;

10 selecting testability indicating a function or capability either cannot be tested or violates specific testing guidelines; and

selecting efficiency indicating production of the correct results.

15

13. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 8 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect reason.

10081710-022002

14. The integrated electronic process as in Claim 13 wherein selecting a defect reason comprises one or more of the following:

5 selecting scope indicating a customer change resulted in a defect;

selecting unaware indicating the lack of awareness of pertinent and available information or making of an incorrect assumption;

selecting mistake indicating a defect by mistake;

10 selecting misapplied process indicating an incorrectly executed process step;

selecting incorrect process indicating a defect caused by an incorrect process step;

15 selecting unclear process indicating a defect caused by not clearly defined information;

selecting no process indicating a defect caused by ad hoc procedures for a situation not covered by a documented process; and

20 selecting reuse indicating an inherent item defect previously assumed to be defect-free.

15. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 8 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect category.

16. An integrated electronic process as in Claim 15 wherein selecting a defect category comprises one or more of the following:

- 5       selecting not properly handling previous data indicating improper initialization of a variable;
- selecting legacy or debug code caused an error;
- selecting wrong data value or data field used indicating an incorrect data value or use of an incorrect data field;
- 10       selecting timing errors;
- selecting conversion or calculation errors;
- selecting functions enabled/disabled incorrectly;
- selecting some action was or was not taken when an event occurred;
- 15       selecting incorrect data file or table error;
- selecting interface errors;
- selecting inadequate range/error checking;
- selecting configuration control error;
- selecting an error introduced while fixing another
- 20 error;
- selecting performance deficiency; and
- selecting pointer/indexing error.

10081710.022002



17. A distributed peer review system for reviewing a development project to evaluate for potential defects in a product under development, comprising:

5 a plurality of personal computers interconnected as a network, wherein at least one of the personal computers comprises a program to:

generating a report identifying potential defects within the rules of an author, moderator and review team members;

10 generating a defects report from a review of the potential defects by the author, moderator and review team members, the report identifying potential defects for acceptance or rejection;

15 generating an action request database for accepted potential defects; and

generating a summary report tracking the rework of accepted defects until the rework of an accepted defect has been completed.

20 18. The distributed peer review system as in Claim 17 wherein the program further comprises creating a database of accepted potential defects removed from the record of potential defects.

25 19. The distributed peer review system as in Claim 17 wherein the plurality of personal computers comprises a first local area network and a second remote local area network.

10081710.022002

20. A distributed peer review system as in Claim 17 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect type.

5        21. A distributed peer review system as in Claim 20 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect reason.

10       22. The distributed peer review system as in Claim 21 wherein identifying potential defects comprises selecting a defect category.

10081710-022000